

Appl. No. 09/605,498

Response to Office Action of June 24, 2005

## REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated June 24, 2005. Claims 1-5 and 7-8 are pending in the patent application. Claims 3 and 7 are canceled and Claims 1, 5 and 8 are amended by this response. No new matter is introduced by these amendments. The Office Action rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-5 and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,389,453 ("Willis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,493,538 ("Jabbaraezbad"). At least for the reasons set forth below, Applicant believes that the rejections raised in the Office Action have been overcome and thus should be withdrawn.

Prompt and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action states that Claim 1 recited a first receiver and a third receiver, but not a second receiver. For clarification purposes Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite a first receiver and a second receiver. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not indefinite and is in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, the claims are rejected for alleged obviousness reasons as noted above.

Claim 1 relates to a communicating method in a network in which a feed and receivers are connected via a unidirectional line and the feed and the receivers are respectively connected to a bidirectional line via routers. The method includes allowing a first router to transmit a first packet including path control information to a first receiver, wherein, in the first packet, a MAC header is added to the head, an IP header is subsequently added, and the path control information is located after the IP header.

Willis relates to a method of transmitting multicast packets unidirectionally from a transmitter of a source network to a receiver of a client network and unicasting packets bidirectionally between the source network and the client network. Willis discloses configuring a selected router of the client network to accept multicast packets from the receiver, establishing a virtual connection between the selected router of the client network and a selected router of the

Appl. No. 09/605,498

Response to Office Action of June 24, 2005

source network, and advertising in the client network that the virtual connection is the shortest path from the client network to the source network. However, Willis does not disclose or suggest that in a packet, a MAC header is added to the head, an IP header is subsequently added, and the path control information is located after the IP header as described in Claim 1.

Jabbaraezhad relates to a system for communicating information between a central site and a remote site. The system includes a central network access device operable to receive a broadcast signal from the central site and to condition the broadcast signal to facilitate its transmission to the remote site using a satellite system. The central network access device is also operable to receive from a wide area network an incoming signal originating from the remote site, and to condition the incoming signal for receipt by the central site. Like Willis, Jabbaraezhad does not disclose or suggest that in a packet, a MAC header is added to the head, an IP header is subsequently added, and the path control information is located after the IP header as described in Claim 1. As a result, neither Willis nor Jabbaraezhad, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests that in a first packet, a MAC header is added to the head, an IP header is subsequently added, and the path control information is located after the IP header as described in Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 and Claims 2 and 4, which depend from Claim 1, are each patentably distinguished over Willis in view of Jabbaraezhad and are in condition for allowance. For similar reasons, Claim 5 and Claim 8, which depends from Claim 5, are each patentably distinguished over Willis in view of Jabbaraezhad and are in condition for allowance.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 8 are patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BY Thomas C. Bassó (46,541)  
Cust. No. 29175Dated: September 26, 2005